

Applicant: Charles C. Brackett  
Serial No.: 09/667,742  
Filed: September 22, 2000



ZMM AF  
Docket No. 15-UL-5580

: Group Art Unit: 2134  
: Examiner: Heneghan, M.E.  
: Date: July 22, 2005

Title: ULTRASOUND IMAGING SYSTEM  
HAVING VIRUS PROTECTION

Hon. Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Sir:

Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified application  
is an Amendment After Final Rejection.

FEE FOR ADDITIONAL CLAIMS

A fee for additional claims is not required.  
 A fee for additional claims is required. The additional fee  
has been calculated as shown below:


CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	NUMBER OF EXTRA CLAIMS	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL CLAIMS:	18 - 29 =	0	x \$50 =	0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS:	2 - 3 =	0	x \$200 =	0
TOTAL FEE DUE			\$	0

Our check for payment of the additional claims fee is enclosed.  
 Please charge \$\_\_\_\_\_ to Deposit Account No. 07-0845 in payment  
of the fee.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any  
extension or other fee under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 which may be required  
by this paper or credit any overpayment of same to Deposit Account No.  
07-0845.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant

  
Dennis M. Flaherty

Reg. No. 31,159  
Ostrager Chong Flaherty &  
Broitman P.C.  
250 Park Avenue, Suite 825  
New York, NY 10177  
(212) 681-0600  
(212) 681-0300 (fax)



Atty. Docket: 15-UL-5580

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Charles C. Brackett : Group Art Unit: 2134

Serial No.: 09/667,742 : Examiner: Heneghan, M.E.

Filed: September 22, 2000

Title: ULTRASOUND IMAGING SYSTEM  
HAVING VIRUS PROTECTION

Hon. Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION**

Sir:

In response to the Final Rejection dated May 3, 2005, the Applicant submits the following argument for reconsideration of the non-obviousness of the invention being claimed in the instant patent application.

ARGUMENT

In ¶ 3 of the office action, claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 30-32, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,379 to Hiyama et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,434 to McGee et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,319,776 to Hile et al. The Applicant traverses this ground for rejection for the following reasons.

Both of independent claims 1 and 30 recite limitations not found in any of the three cited patents, namely, that a registry file contains encrypted data representing a list of